

Issues and Concerns from WFIP Review
WFU Workshop, ABQ
Feb 2, 2006 (Dan Buckley)

1. Moving up and down in the FUMA Decision Chart confused with remaining in highest Stage WFIP prepared (see pages 21 & 22)– if a WFU stalls for three weeks, is a FUM2 really needed?

Tom Zimmerman offered an explanation why this was written the way it was and conceded that it should be clarified to read that it is permissible to move down to an ICT4 in Stage II or III, once it has been determined that a FUM1 or FUM2 is no longer needed. Reasons could include a lull or halt of fire spread and activity.

ACTION ITEM: NIFCG write a clarification letter to be signed by the fire directors and then distribute to the field before the 2006 fire season.

2. When can a WFU revert back to the local unit (when they have no FUM2)?

This is related to item # 1 above and should be covered in the above clarification letter.

ACTION ITEM: NIFCG clarification letter to address this issue and distribute to field before 2006 fire season.

3. Is 10,000 acres in AK a “large fire”?

Conflict over what is relative to Alaska and what is the national standard for a large fire. Zimmerman explained the *Wildland Fire Relative Risk Assessment* charts were purposely developed not to specify a standard for the entire nation, and it was up to users to exercise their judgment on fire size, time of season, etc. Alaska countered that standards exist for classifying fires, and they had already dealt with and narrowly were exonerated in a lawsuit over the meaning of “aggressive initial attack.” It was suggested that AK develop criteria for what constitutes a large fire.

ACTION ITEM: NIFCG check with agency reps in AK before 2006 fire season to see if they have developed criteria.

4. Monitoring– long and short term– page 35

Discussed briefly and determined that this issue was best left to the fire program at the local level, and should not be dealt with in the guide. NO ACTION AT THIS TIME.

5. Analysis of Stage 1 decisions to Suppress WFU’s

Suggestion was to analyze why fires were being suppressed rather than being managed as WFU’s using data on Stage I WFIP. Currently no mechanism exists to collect the data, but may be possible to do so with future releases of WFSA/WFIP.

ACTION ITEM: For present, leave data analysis to local unit, if they choose to do so. In future, when data is easily obtained, this may be feasible to track.

6. Broaden concept and definition of MAP's to include Management Action Areas, lines and appropriate situations; clarify these in the guide and standardize the m-- Rocky Mtn FUMT #1 & work they did on Frank Church Complex 2005 (NO NEED TO ADD TERMS; ALLOW MAP TO REPRESENT AREAS OR LINES)

Discussion occurred on the need to better explain Management Action Points by using Management Action Areas as a subset. It was expressed that this would make it easier to help those new to WFU explain concepts easier. Add "temporal and spatial" to help clarify.

ACTION ITEM: No action at this time. See page 36, column 1 of WFIP guide for explanation of MAP. This passage covers temporal and spatial component.

7. Refine thresholds for transitions from Stage 1-2-3.

No discussion occurred on this issue; NO ACTION NEEDED.

8. Include Objectives box in Stage 1.

This was considered during development but was not included in Stage 1. Reasons it was left to Stage II is initial objectives should be located in FMP or LMP that allows for WFU. As fire grows in size and complexity, more specific objectives are developed in Stage II. NO ACTION NEEDED.

9. Definitions should be included in the WFIP guide.

Tom Zimmerman explained definitions were in the draft of the WFIP, but were removed by the National Fire and Aviation Executive Board (NFAEB). Reasons given were that NFAEB preferred to maintain one source for definitions (NWCG Glossary?).

ACTION ITEM: Attempt to include definitions in next revision of WFIP guide, or at least identify source.

END